



Security Council

Sixty-second year

*Provisional***5635**th meetingFriday, 23 February 2007, 3 p.m.
New York

<i>President:</i>	Mr. Burian	(Slovakia)
<i>Members:</i>	Belgium	Mr. Cartuyvels
	China	Ms. Song Danhui
	Congo	Mr. Biabaroh-Iboro
	France	Ms. Rouillard
	Ghana	Mr. Christian
	Indonesia	Mr. Kleib
	Italy	Mr. Mantovani
	Panama	Mr. Arias
	Peru	Mr. Pérez
	Qatar	Mr. Al-Sulaiti
	Russian Federation	Mr. Paletskiy
	South Africa	Mr. Paschalis
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mrs. Job
	United States of America	Ms. Willson

Agenda

Non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction

Implementation of resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006)

Letter dated 12 February 2007 from the Permanent Representative of Slovakia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2007/84)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.



The meeting resumed at 3.10 p.m.

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the consideration without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran took the seat reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Norway.

Mr. Løvald (Norway): Norway welcomes the debate on cooperation between the Security Council and international organizations in the implementation of resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006). Those resolutions address the most pressing proliferation challenges of today. We are therefore firmly committed to their implementation.

Resolution 1540 (2004) constitutes an essential element of the global counter-proliferation and counter-terrorism regime. It is imperative that individual States implement and enforce national export control regulations called for in the resolution on the basis of high international standards. Only in that way can we develop a no-go area for proliferators and illicit procurement activities.

Although resolution 1540 (2004) recognizes that national Governments are responsible for establishing effective domestic controls to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, it is absolutely essential that their efforts be coordinated through international cooperation. In that regard, we attach great importance to paragraph 7 of the resolution, which recognizes that some States may require assistance in implementing the provisions of the resolution and invites States that are in a position to do so to offer assistance in response to specific requests.

Norway has for many years supported various activities in the field of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. Financial support has been channelled through the United Nations system and to various Norwegian and international research institutions. We have also provided funding for seminars on implementing resolution 1540 (2004).

Through regional seminars and outreach programmes, the Committee and Member States have commendably focused on increasing the quantity and quality of reporting. Ongoing work with that focus is necessary and welcome. The debate here today is particularly welcome because there is also a need to improve the form and quality of outreach and assistance in that regard. Not only do States have a responsibility for reporting, but those States and organizations which provide assistance also have a duty to ensure that, to the fullest extent possible, it is effective, efficient and well coordinated.

Because the obligations under resolution 1540 (2004) overlap and interlock with numerous international agreements and regimes, as well as bilateral programmes, that requires understanding the full scope and content of the assistance that is already provided by States and international and regional organizations, sharing lessons learned and, where possible, developing common and realistic expectations of information-sharing, cooperation and coordination. Norway hopes that this debate will move us in that direction.

My Government is also pleased to announce that it is co-hosting, with the Governments of Germany and Chile, an upcoming workshop on national non-proliferation controls, a topic which reflects the diverse obligations, mechanisms and actors that must work in concert to achieve effective implementation of resolution 1540 (2004) and, more broadly, for a strengthened non-proliferation regime.

The main items to be discussed at the workshop this coming spring include implementation challenges, assistance and enhanced cooperation. Norway and its co-organizers expect that the workshop will produce recommendations to help donors, organizations and States seeking assistance to better focus and coordinate their own efforts, taking into account existing programmes and their comparative advantages. Workshop recommendations should account for common challenges and lessons learned, and donors

and providers of assistance would benefit from the participation of a select number of countries receiving such assistance. We also hope that the recommendations which emerge from the workshop will contribute to the aims proposed by the Committee Chairman in his opening remarks here today and in the proposed presidential statement.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Israel.

Mr. Carmon (Israel): At the outset, allow me to express our gratitude to you, Sir, for your able stewardship of the Council this month and to commend you for convening this debate.

Israel was a strong supporter of the adoption of Security Council resolution 1540 (2004). The resolution is, in our opinion, a significant step towards the consolidation and implementation of international standards against the threats of international terrorism. It is also, of course, an important step in support of the international effort against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

The possibility that weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery could fall into the hands of terrorists and the threat of unmonitored transfer of sensitive items have become, in recent years, one of the worst nightmares of the international community. Resolution 1540 (2004) and its full implementation represent important progress in our joint struggle to prevent the realization of that terrifying scenario. The International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism is yet another significant step forward in that context.

The commitment of Member States to prevent any cooperation with terrorists and terrorist organizations attempting to acquire or develop weapons of mass destruction, and the commitment to set clear and strong standards for monitoring dual-use types of items, are vital tools in our efforts.

Moreover, we are of the view that some components of that important resolution can also be relevant to the prevention of transfer of conventional arms to terrorists. It is particularly relevant when the presence of sophisticated weaponry in the hands of terrorists has proven to have strategic implications. In that context, it should be noted that rockets of various ranges can serve as a means to launch chemical and biological weapons. The transfer of such rockets to

non-State actors — in particular to terrorists — is therefore already a violation of paragraphs 1 and 2 of resolution 1540 (2004). That violation has clearly been demonstrated by the uranium supplied to the Hizbollah terrorist organization, as witnessed recently in Lebanon.

For its part, Israel has made significant progress in aligning itself with the highest international standards in the field of exports control on sensitive items, including dual-use items, by adopting into Israeli law the various lists of the supplier regimes, namely, those of the Nuclear Suppliers Group, the Australia Group and the Wassenaar Arrangement. Furthermore, Israel maintains a continuous dialogue with the various regimes and with relevant States, with the aim of improving control over facilities and items at the highest level.

We hope that all States will act in accordance with resolution 1540 (2004). True implementation of the resolution could contribute to a safer world. For its part, Israel is fully committed to it.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Mr. Hill (Australia): Australia welcomes this opportunity to discuss resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006) on the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Apart from saying a few words on behalf of my country, I also want to associate myself with the statement that will be delivered shortly by the representative of New Zealand on behalf of the Pacific Islands Forum. Australia strongly supports Security Council efforts to prevent the proliferation of WMD. We encourage the Council to be as active as possible in that regard.

The unanimous adoption of resolution 1540 (2004) was a historic achievement. It was the first international instrument to place obligations on all States to take comprehensive action to prevent the proliferation of WMD, their means of delivery and related materials in an integrated and comprehensive manner. The resolution specifically focused on the risk to all States posed by non-State actors obtaining weapons of mass destruction. It makes strong national controls on WMD-related material and technologies and the enforcement of such controls a requirement for all States.

Those measures are no longer merely an option for States to consider. Resolution 1540 (2004) required all Member States of the United Nations to submit a report on the steps they have taken, or intend to take, to implement the resolution. It is a matter of regret that some States have still not been able to submit their reports to the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004). We encourage them to do so as soon as possible.

In that regard, Australia recognizes that some States might require assistance in implementing the provisions of the resolution. In fact, that is recognized in the resolution itself. Australia has already provided such assistance bilaterally and in conjunction with our regional neighbours, including through the Pacific Islands Forum. We are, of course, willing to continue to provide such assistance to ensure that States have the legal and regulatory infrastructure, capacity and experience to fulfil the provisions of the resolution.

In addition to domestic action by States there is also a range of international regimes that address the issues covered by resolution 1540 (2004). Not all of those international regimes are suitable or appropriate for all States to join, but they demonstrate the ways in which the resolution operates interactively with a range of other international non-proliferation and safeguards regimes. I would like to mention just two.

First, I would recall that resolution 1540 (2004) requires States to adopt controls on brokering activities. For most States that is a relatively new field, but it has become increasingly clear, in the current security environment, that controls on brokering activities involving conventional, military and WMD-related goods have an important role to play in preventing proliferation. The Australia Group has commenced discussions on brokering activities, as have other non-proliferation and safeguards regimes.

The Republic of Korea has now taken the initiative to host an international seminar on brokering controls, to be held in Seoul at the end of March, to which members of non-proliferation and safeguards regimes will be invited, as well as other regional participants. Australia is proud to be co-chairing that important seminar with our Korean colleagues.

I also want to mention one other important, and indeed essential, international tool that reinforces the goals of the resolution. Australia is a participant in the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI), which, I would

like to remind members, aims at preventing trafficking in WMD, their delivery systems and related material to and from States and to non-State actors of proliferation concern. In the light of the statement by the Ambassador of Cuba, I should remind the Council that PSI activities are to be consistent with national legal authorities and international frameworks. Over 80 states have endorsed the PSI. We would, of course, regard it as more effective if it ultimately achieved global coverage. We would therefore like to take this opportunity to invite other States to consider joining the Proliferation Security Initiative, in order that it may ultimately have that global adherence.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of El Salvador.

Mr. Martínez Flores (El Salvador) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Government of El Salvador would like to reiterate its firm support for all measures adopted at the United Nations to combat international terrorism. Such measures should be implemented in accordance with the principles of the Charter, international law and international agreements and conventions on the matter.

We small countries share the concern of the international community, for we understand that the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and their means of delivery threatens our sovereignty as well as international peace and security — as proliferation turns our countries into illicit transit channels for such materials.

We are fully convinced that combating terrorism must take place in the context of a legal framework that conveys the necessary legitimacy upon Governments as they seek to achieve the goals of that effort. But we also believe that it is of the utmost importance to strengthen international cooperation, as that is a key element in ensuring greater effectiveness and efficiency for preventive efforts.

Our commitment to the fight against international terrorism has guided our efforts at the domestic, bilateral, subregional, regional and international levels. We have reinstated our national security council, which, among other things, provides advice to our country's President and assesses the situation with a view to determining the steps to be taken to prevent, suppress and control terrorist acts and related crimes.

Our inter-agency counter-terrorism group is responsible for formulating, implementing and managing technical efforts to combat terrorism. The group carries out its work in four specialized areas, namely, security, financial matters, border control and legal affairs. Its mandate is therefore fully in line with the provisions of paragraph 5 of resolution 1673 (2006). Among its other responsibilities, the group has prepared the reports that the Government of El Salvador has presented to international organizations in connection with its compliance with resolutions, mandates and international instruments to which we are party as part of the fight against terrorism.

The group also drafted the special law on terrorist acts, which my country's legislative assembly has already adopted. The law includes provisions relating to the prevention, investigation, punishment and eradication of crimes associated with terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, including the financing of terrorism and related activities. The legislation empowers the competent legal authorities to take the necessary steps to freeze assets and funds of, and financial transactions by, persons and organizations identified by the Security Council in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the Organization. The terrorism law also contains a chapter on the financing of terrorism as a separate crime, and in that context includes a regulation relating to measures to control financing, such as the freezing of assets regardless of their provenance.

With regard to non-profit organizations, a special regulation has been considered that is aimed at better monitoring the assets of such organizations, averting the possibility of their being used to commit crimes, especially the crime of financing terrorism.

Other measures we are continuing to implement include ongoing vehicle checks on international roads, migration controls and inspections at hotels, land terminals and other locations frequented by foreigners. The armed forces of El Salvador, with the support of the national police, have also put in place better controls with respect to the smuggling of goods and narcotic drugs into or through our territory.

El Salvador has submitted the relevant report in compliance with resolution 1540 (2004).

The Government of El Salvador will continue to take all necessary administrative and legal measures,

and we are prepared to strengthen international cooperation in various fields to enhance the effectiveness of the fight against terrorism in all its forms and manifestations. We hope that we will soon reach agreement on a comprehensive convention on international terrorism, and in that respect we offer our full cooperation.

The President: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Pakistan, to whom I give the floor.

Mr. Hashmi (Pakistan): I have the honour to present Pakistan's statement to the Council on behalf of Ambassador Munir Akram, who sends his regrets, as he is delayed as a result of heavy traffic.

Mr. President, we thank you for having convened this timely debate. We welcome the decision to hold an open debate in the Council. It is a rare privilege for non-members of the Council to be able to discuss the importance and relevance of resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006) in this Chamber.

We thank the Director General of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) for his comprehensive statement, and express our appreciation also for the statements made by the representatives of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the World Customs Organization.

Both resolution 1540 (2004) and resolution 1673 (2006) provide for coordination and cooperation with international organizations so as to advance the objectives of resolution 1540 (2004). At the same time, resolution 1540 (2004) also affirms that none of the obligations contained therein shall be interpreted so as to alter the responsibilities of the IAEA or the OPCW. We fully acknowledge the important work being done by international organizations such as the IAEA and the OPCW in building the capacity of the States members of those organizations in many areas.

It is important that, in associating these organizations with the work of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004), their own functions and responsibilities be fully preserved. In any case, these international organizations predate resolution 1540 (2004) and would have continued their important work regardless of the resolution.

Some Council members, surely the permanent members, may recall that concerns were raised in December 2004 over the capacity of the 1540 Committee, in the context of its expertise, manpower

and resources, to promote implementation of resolution 1540 (2004). Almost three years after the adoption of that resolution, it is clear that the 1540 Committee has done whatever it can within its capacity constraints.

The concept paper presented by Slovakia in connection with this debate notes that 135 Member States have submitted their first national implementation reports and that 85 have provided additional information. Pakistan has provided two reports to the 1540 Committee. The concept paper provides general information on the challenges faced in implementing the resolutions. The reasons for non-reporting by a number of States need to be examined in a cooperative and constructive manner.

It is clear that many States lack the necessary expertise and resources related to the implementation of resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006). There are also vast differences in the economic, industrial, legal and financial profiles of Member States. More importantly, there is a general perception that there is a wide gap between the promises made and the provision of the assistance required, especially by developing States. An additional problem is reporting fatigue, including for those States which have filed implementation reports.

Resolution 1540 (2004) rightly affirmed that prevention of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) should not hamper international cooperation in materials, equipment and technology for peaceful purposes, while the goal of peaceful utilization should not be used as a cover for proliferation. The growing global demand for nuclear power generation underlines the need for equitable and non-discriminatory steps by supplier States to strike a balance between proliferation concerns and facilitation of the legitimate trade in equipment, materials and technology for the increased generation of nuclear energy.

One of the ways in which such a balance could be achieved would be to commence negotiations for truly multilateral arrangements for governing the trade in dual-use and sensitive items and technology. The existing arrangements, and their selective application, remain contrary to the spirit of resolution 1540 (2004).

We wish to take this opportunity to say a few words on the working methods of the 1540 Committee, especially with regard to the hiring of its experts. The manner in which the contracts of some experts have

been handled reinforces the widely held perception outside the Council that the whole process of marshalling the resolution, its implementation, the composition of the Committee, its experts and staff is being led by the developed countries, to the exclusion of a large number of countries from the developing world. We hope that the Council and the Committee will seek to ensure an adequate and equitable representation of experts from the developing countries in a transparent manner.

The level of implementation of national measures by Member States, the gaps between assurances and supply of assistance, and the lack of capacity on the part of Member States as well as of the 1540 Committee, should lead to a critical assessment of the competence and capability of the Council to promote the non-proliferation agenda. Member States may also have to evaluate the outcome of the "encouragement" provided by resolution 1540 (2004) in the past three years to fully implement the disarmament treaties and agreements. In the context of the Council's growing interest in preventing WMD proliferation, it is important to reconcile and balance the lack of implementation of disarmament obligations by certain Council members with their zeal in promoting non-proliferation. Discrimination and double standards are the enemy of collective purpose and action.

When resolution 1540 (2004) was adopted, Pakistan, then a member of the Council, joined the consensus because we concurred that there was a gap in the international rules relating to the acquisition and illicit transfer of WMD by non-State actors. We also agreed that the matter was important and urgent enough to be addressed in an exceptional manner by the Security Council. Now that the Council has addressed the urgent dimension of the danger, it is necessary to revert to the normal avenues for the creation of international rules and norms, that is, through the process of international treaty-making. The time has now come to revive the multilateral disarmament machinery, so that future challenges in the area of non-proliferation can be addressed in open, transparent and inclusive processes.

In that context, we believe that the General Assembly should begin early discussions to authorize the convening of an international diplomatic conference, or request the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva to negotiate an international treaty to address the issue of the acquisition of WMD by

non-State actors or terrorists. Such a treaty could be based on the provisions of resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006). It should achieve what resolution 1540 (2004) did not, that is, provide clear definitions of non-State actors, means of delivery, related materials, and so on. That would facilitate the adoption of national legislation.

The treaty should also create appropriate executive and administrative bodies to promote adherence and facilitate international assistance and cooperation — along the lines, for example, of the national authorities that are required to be established under the Chemical Weapons Convention and which are assisted in their work by the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. The International Atomic Energy Agency also has a similar facilitation role under its various conventions and programmes. Finally, the treaty should also establish the mechanisms necessary to ensure equitable implementation, monitoring and compliance with its provisions.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Argentina.

Mr. García Moritán (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): First of all, Mr. President, allow me to express my delegation's gratitude for your organization of this open Security Council debate on cooperation between the Council and relevant international organizations in the implementation of resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006).

This debate has given us the opportunity to be in direct contact with organizations such as the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) and the World Customs Organization (WCO), whose work in this field is of fundamental importance and should enjoy the firm support of all Member States.

International cooperation in the non-proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and their means of delivery and related materials is of crucial importance in achieving the Security Council's objective of prevailing in the fight against the threat to international peace and security posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and by international terrorism. We believe also that specific actions in the field of non-proliferation must go hand in hand with a clear and specific commitment that can be translated into a plan of action in the field of

disarmament by all members of the international community.

My country has offered its support to those countries that may need assistance in the implementation of obligations arising out of resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006), especially countries in our region.

In June 2005, together with the Government of Spain, we organized a first regional seminar on the implementation of resolution 1540 (2004), held in Guatemala. Its objective was to address the specific difficulties of the countries of Central America and the Caribbean. Subsequently, in September of the same year, we organized another seminar, this time together with the United Kingdom, in Buenos Aires, Argentina. That seminar was the first time since its establishment that the 1540 Committee had the opportunity to be in contact with the entire region. Argentina also actively participated in the seminar held in Peru last November under the auspices of Spain and the European Union.

It is because we believe that in this area regional cooperation is fundamental that we are meeting the challenge of implementing these extremely important resolutions. That is why cooperation with regional and subregional organizations should also be encouraged.

We submitted in a timely manner our national report, prepared by our Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which is our focal point on this issue, with the support of an inter-ministerial commission created for this purpose. The report has since been updated. Those actions mesh with national criminal and administrative legislation to implement at the national level our international obligations. In this context, I would like to note that Argentine legislation is under constant review and revision so that we can make the necessary changes. Argentina's commitment to disarmament and non-proliferation is reflected in our adoption of all existing export control regimes and their national implementation through a commission established for that purpose as early as 1992.

In that context, our work and the experience we have gained enable us to offer any support that other countries of the region may request to help with national implementation in the technical, judicial and customs fields.

My delegation would like to reaffirm its support for the work of the Committee and recalls that

resolution 1673 (2006) requested that it intensify its efforts through a work programme to include the compilation of information, outreach, dialogue, assistance and cooperation. Within this framework of action, the adoption of measures for accounting, physical protection, border and police control and national control of trans-shipment and export, including monitoring the provision of financial and other services, is of particular importance.

In this respect, we renew Argentina's commitment to these objectives and hope that the action plan promoted by the 1540 Committee will enable us to achieve our common goals.

Let me reiterate the determination of the Argentine Government in the fight against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, their means of delivery and related materials, as well as our readiness to move forward together with the international community in the fight against terrorism.

Finally, we would like to say that we regret the way in which the 1540 Committee recently proceeded to renew the contracts of the groups of experts. We urge that, in the future, criteria be used, both for selecting experts and for renewing their contracts, that would ensure that the solution is transparent and that would guarantee equality for all Members of the United Nations.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Oh Joon (Republic of Korea): First of all, Mr. President, I would like to join previous speakers in thanking you for convening today's open debate on the implementation of Security Council resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006). My delegation views today's debate as an opportunity to renew our commitment to the full implementation of those resolutions and to share our views on the best means of doing so.

The world today faces mounting threats from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Particularly frightening is the possibility of such weapons being used by terrorists. It has become imperative for the international community to work together to address these threats. Against this backdrop, the Security Council's unanimous adoption of resolution 1540 (2004) was a historic step which was reinforced last year with the adoption of resolution 1673 (2006).

Three years after the passage of resolution 1540 (2004), there are still daunting challenges to the attainment of its goals. As indicated in the concept paper prepared for today's debate (S/2007/84, annex), there are 58 States that have not yet submitted their first national reports on implementation. While the submission of a report does not guarantee implementation, it is an important first step in the process. My delegation therefore calls for universal submission of national reports. More intensive efforts should be made to achieve that end. In this regard, we welcome the 1540 Committee's programme of work to intensify its outreach activities and to assist States in preparing and submitting national reports.

According to the Committee's analysis of those national reports that have been submitted, there are in many cases significant gaps between the commitments of States to the resolution and their practical implementation of its requirements. There are also imbalances in implementation among States and regions. My delegation believes that identifying and understanding these gaps and imbalances is important to ensure the full and effective implementation of the resolution in the mid to long term. In this respect, the Committee needs to strengthen its monitoring role. It would also be useful to promote good practices and share lessons learned in closing the gaps and eliminating the imbalances.

While implementation of resolution 1540 (2004) at the national level is fundamental, full and effective implementation will also require coordination and cooperation at the subregional, regional and international levels. Regional and subregional initiatives aimed at implementation would not only spur national Governments to action, but would also provide a positive example for nations in other regions.

Also conducive to attaining the goals of the resolution is the sharing of information and experience on the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction with relevant international organizations and export control regimes. In that respect, it is welcome and opportune that representatives of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons and the World Customs Organization are participating in today's debate. Similarly, we welcome the initiative of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) to work closely with international and regional organizations.

The Republic of Korea has been an active participant in international efforts aimed at the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in all its aspects and is a State party to most international disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and multilateral export control regimes. We have faithfully implemented resolution 1540 (2004), putting in place the necessary legal and administrative systems to ensure compliance. We are committed to its full implementation at the national, regional and international levels.

In that regard, my delegation is pleased to report that the Republic of Korea, together with Australia — as stated earlier by the representative of Australia — will host an international seminar next month in Seoul on the subject of brokering controls in all its aspects, at which one session will be devoted to Security Council resolutions on non-proliferation, including resolution 1540 (2004).

Let me close by commending the strenuous efforts of the 1540 Committee and its Chairman, Ambassador Burian, to facilitate implementation of the resolution. We assure him of our full support and cooperation in that important endeavour.

The President: I now call on the representative of Japan.

Mr. Shinyo (Japan): At the outset, since we have not had an opportunity for quite some time in this Chamber to have a discussion focused solely on resolution 1540 (2004), I highly commend your initiative, Mr. President, to hold an open debate on this important subject, as you currently chair the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004). I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Mr. Nobuaki Tanaka, Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, and the representatives of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the World Customs Organization for their statements.

Last week, a workshop on the implementation of resolution 1540 (2004) was held in San Francisco, for the first time within the framework of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations Regional Forum (ARF), and an expert from my delegation took part. I received a report that the workshop was quite fruitful. In that regard, I wish to thank the Governments of the United States, Canada and Singapore, which were its sponsors. At the workshop, the Regional Forum participants

explained their national efforts to implement resolution 1540 (2004), and it is impressive that a number of Asian countries have made strides in its implementation. That fact, in my view, is attributable to the outreach activities undertaken by you, Mr. President, in particular. I believe that it also demonstrates that the activities related to resolution 1540 (2004) have apparently shifted from the stage of reporting to the next phase. At the same time, on the basis of the discussions at the workshop and my mission's experience while serving on the 1540 Committee for the past two years, it appears that the challenges surrounding the implementation of resolution 1540 (2004) have become clearer. Today, I would like to share some thoughts on those challenges.

First, as regards cooperation with international organizations, the 1540 Committee itself does not have the capacity at this point to provide assistance to Member States. Therefore, international organizations that have assistance agendas should play active roles. I was encouraged by the statements made by the representatives of the competent international organizations. It is necessary for those countries that need assistance to communicate with those organizations in order to receive adequate assistance.

At the same time, since assistance needs may vary, depending on the situation in each State, donors should provide tailor-made assistance in order to address the specific needs of the recipients. In that connection, I welcome the initiative by Norway, Germany and Chile to hold a workshop here in New York in March, aimed at, among other things, closer coordination among donor countries and relevant international and regional organizations.

Japan, for its part, is providing a wide variety of programmes and seminars for capacity-building and training in such areas as aviation security, maritime and port security and customs and export control. Moreover, Japan recently organized the Asian Senior-level Talks on Non-Proliferation for the third time since 2004, to discuss ways to accelerate efforts aimed at the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in Asia. Japan looks forward to coordinating closely with international organizations and other potential donors for the further enhancement of global cooperation in this area.

Secondly, the existence of gaps in various aspects of implementation on the part of many countries

remains a problem. It is often pointed out that, in a number of States, high priority is not necessarily given to this area, as opposed to development assistance, and that in inter-agency processes the relevant agencies do not provide enough support for the implementation of resolution 1540 (2004). Those issues should, in principle, be tackled by each individual country, but, if other countries could share their experience in overcoming them, it would be very helpful. When we discuss the necessity of sharing experience, we tend to talk only about good experience. The fact is that the sharing of bad experience, and prescriptions for addressing such difficulties, would be the most useful information for States confronting similar problems.

Thirdly, there is a need for the extensive utilization of expert knowledge. In recent months, the interest of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and think tanks in resolution 1540 (2004) has grown. We welcome opinions expressed by research institutions, regardless of their political positions, because they not only help increase awareness regarding the resolution but also provide new perspectives for Member States to consider. The seminar recently organized by think tanks succinctly summarized the challenges for the resolution, including those that I have just enumerated. Such recommendations and observations should not simply be presented without being properly followed up; it is important that such points be further elaborated and reflected in the discussions in the 1540 Committee and, moreover, in the Security Council.

As is often pointed out, the implementation of resolution 1540 (2004) is a long-term process, and there is no magic formula. Member States should bring their expertise together, with the help of international organizations and NGOs, and thoroughly discuss ways to further effectively implement the resolution. To that end, I look forward to having further opportunities to discuss this issue on a regular basis.

The President: I now call on the representative of Guatemala.

Mr. Skinner-Klée (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, my delegation wishes to thank the delegation of Slovakia for having convened this open debate on an issue that is of great importance to my country. I should also like to congratulate you in particular, Mr. President, on your commendable work

as Chairman of the Security Council established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004).

Today's meeting gives countries not members of the Security Council an opportunity to receive information on the activities of international agencies in the field and to offer observations on issues of general interest, in particular concerning exchanges of experiences, the preparation of national reports to the 1540 Committee and training in report preparation for States that so request in their efforts to comply with the provisions of paragraph 4 of the resolution.

Guatemala also wishes to thank the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, the Director-General of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) and the representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for their informative reports this morning.

Resolution 1540 (2004) is particularly important in fighting terrorism because it establishes a prevention mechanism aimed at preventing non-State actors, in particular terrorist groups, from acquiring weapons of mass destruction, their means of delivery and related materials. Guatemala's commitment to the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction results from our conviction that a clear and committed policy in that field helps increase security around the world and in specific regions, while at the same time increasing the opportunities for growth and development.

In that context, Guatemala submitted its national report to the 1540 Committee in October 2004. I wish to point out that the preparation of the report, although difficult, was an enriching task because it enabled us more precisely to identify and understand the weaknesses and strengths of the Guatemalan system and also made possible the full and active participation of all national institutions working in this area.

This exercise not only ensured better inter-institutional coordination, the creation of awareness in the public and private sectors and the identification of legal gaps and shortcomings in the implementation of legislation; it also underscored the need to update our legislation to accord with the State's international obligations.

With regard to experience gained at the national level, the inter-institutional consultation mechanism

enabled us to identify both administrative and legislative needs. As a result, our own inter-institutional committee worked on the preparation of a draft counter-terrorism law. The draft law is aimed at ensuring harsh punishment for any terrorist act. It comprises a body of regulations that will allow us to prevent terrorist acts and maintain tight security controls, through the establishment of a national counter-terrorism security council whose composition and functions will focus on the prevention and control of terrorism.

My delegation believes that assistance and resources, especially for developing countries, are essential for effective implementation of the relevant national measures, because the main objectives behind the adoption of resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006) will be very difficult to achieve without international cooperation and assistance. We commend the achievements of the 1540 Committee in its outreach activities at the regional and subregional levels through the organization of workshops and seminars, especially in Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, in order to create a space for the exchange of ideas on the scope of resolution 1540 (2004), to share national experiences in preparing reports and to become familiar with the degree of national implementation of international instruments on weapons of mass destruction. We especially thank the European Union for its technical and financial assistance in holding such seminars.

The first regional meeting on the implementation of resolution 1540 (2004) for countries of Central America and the Caribbean was held in Antigua, Guatemala, in June 2005. It was sponsored by the Governments of Argentina and Spain and specifically addressed the preparation of reports. Guatemala was also privileged to participate in the regional seminars on the implementation of resolution 1540 (2004) in Latin America and the Caribbean which were held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in September 2005, and more recently in Lima, Peru, in November 2006.

Those seminars have helped encourage full implementation of the resolution and have provided clear guidelines for future regional cooperation in our collective efforts to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. They also highlighted the need to promote technical assistance initiatives to facilitate the implementation of the resolution and to

strengthen the role of regional and subregional organizations in activities in this sphere.

In that context, we are happy to see that the Committee is continuing to strengthen its links to international and regional organizations such as the European Union, the Organization of American States, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the World Customs Organization and the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, among others, in order to benefit from their experience.

We should be aware that national reports are important for understanding the scope of the difficulties we face and the best way to approach them. It will benefit all of us if we are frank and open with regard to our capacity to respond to the threats of proliferation. A critical review by each State of its own laws and regulations will also enable us to identify shortcomings. However, we must take into account national capacities, because the increasingly frequent requests by the Security Council for reports sometimes leads to overburdening State institutions in their administrative work, and in the majority of cases, it is difficult to comply, as the representatives of South Africa and Indonesia noted this morning.

There is still a great deal to do in order to achieve a universal system for the submission of reports in compliance with both resolution 1540 (2004) and with other Security Council resolutions that also request reports. However, we are certain that with this type of broad discussion — and with your efforts, Mr. President — we will be able to make progress in a coordinated and effective fashion. Recently, the Government of Guatemala requested, through the proper channels, technical and financial assistance from the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean, in order to complete our national report and make our due contributions.

We listened with interest to the ideas put forward during today's debate and will continue to assess them. Guatemala believes that the outcome of the Council's deliberation on this matter will help us to harmonize our counter-terrorism and non-proliferation efforts and will lead to greater security for our citizens.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Uruguay.

Mr. Rosselli (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): I am pleased to congratulate you once again, Sir, and to thank your delegation for its initiative in bringing to the Security Council issues, such as the theme of today's discussion, which are of interest to all of us.

In many forums, Uruguay has stated its concern at the lack of concrete progress in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. The present context of multilateral negotiations on disarmament and non-proliferation is not at all encouraging. The Conference on Disarmament has not been able to adopt an agenda enabling it to resume its substantive work. The 2006 Conference to Review Progress Made in the Implementation of the Programme of Action on Small Arms achieved no concrete outcome, and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty continues to await entry into force 10 years after it opened for signature.

Next year, preparatory activities for a new stage in the review of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) will begin. As has been the tradition in recent review conferences, we do not envisage significant progress on the substantive issues on the agenda, because the nuclear disarmament process has been nearly paralyzed since the Treaty was extended indefinitely in 1995.

In that context, Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) is a notable element in the fight against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; in our view, it clearly points the way towards strengthening the system developed by the United Nations — especially since 1991 — to combat international terrorism.

A few days ago we marked a major anniversary of the Treaty of Tlatelolco and of the system that sees to the nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America and the Caribbean. It has now been 40 years since the Treaty was signed, establishing the first of the nuclear-weapon-free zones that have been created around the world through the Treaties of Raratonga, Pelindaba and Bangkok and through the Antarctic Treaty System.

Uruguay has always been at the forefront in the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. That is why we firmly support instruments that, like resolution 1540 (2004), promote fundamental aspects of collective security and make major contributions to combating international terrorism.

We should also hail two other outstanding instruments in the normative sphere related to the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons: the Charter and the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). By means of the verification system established through the signature of safeguards agreements and additional protocols, it is possible in most cases to detect possible discrepancies in the movement of materials that could be diverted for military or criminal purposes. The IAEA also plays an important role in early warning of suspicious operations related to the illicit trade in nuclear or radioactive materials. It does this by means of a database that systematically logs illicit trafficking or other unauthorized activity with respect to such materials. The IAEA has developed excellent programmes as the technical body that the Security Council needs for reporting and advice; its importance has grown over the past few years.

Another source of technical expertise is the Provisional Technical Secretariat of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty Organization. Uruguay urges the prompt entry into force of the Treaty machinery and, in the meantime, a strengthening of the activities of the Preparatory Commission, including two elements vital for cooperation in a world free of nuclear testing and clandestine nuclear activities: the International Monitoring System and the system of on-site inspections. Both of these are of the greatest importance, which is why, as signatory States decide to join the system and enable it to enter into force, they should continue to provide the greatest possible support to those activities.

Resolution 1540 (2004) has been a catalyst for activities to control the existence and the illicit trade in weapons of mass destruction, their delivery systems and precursor substances that could be used to produce them. The 1540 Committee has done outstanding work. It has operated with great efficiency and transparency in the various areas within its mandate, making possible an easy dialogue between national authorities and members of the Council and establishing clear rules making for smooth international cooperation both with the Committee and among States. The machinery established in fulfilment of its mandate has enabled it to consider many national reports and has spurred the creation of internal coordination bodies to adapt

national control procedures, as required for full implementation of resolution 1540 (2004).

Uruguay has already submitted two reports to the 1540 Committee and has completed the form that systematically brings together the various elements on which periodic information is required.

Although reporting systems are common to all the sanctions committees — in particular, those aimed principally at combating international terrorism in all its forms — the procedures of the 1540 Committee have been clear and easy to implement, certainly as far as the Uruguayan authorities are concerned. In that context, I wish to report that our national authorities for monitoring nuclear and radioactive materials and chemical weapons, as well as our health authorities at the highest level, are in a position to implement the provisions of the resolution, although they may request technical assistance from the relevant international cooperation systems, as required.

Uruguay welcomes the seminars held in various regional contexts to promote the implementation of the provisions of resolution 1540 (2004). We participated actively in the seminars that took place at Buenos Aires in 2005 and at Lima in 2006. It is our understanding that such activities, including the launching of a legislative database on States' implementation of the provisions of the resolution, can improve the system, which would help strengthen that system and make possible the full implementation of the Council mandate.

But for this to take place in a natural way, greater participation by Member States is needed. That means the sustained development of cooperation activities and constant efforts to engage those States that, owing to their national positions, are not part of the system and to persuade them to join.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Bangladesh.

Mr. Chowdhury (Bangladesh): Against the backdrop of the small progress made in the implementation of Security Council resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006), the convening of this meeting could not be more timely. I begin by thanking you, Mr. President, for your initiatives. We also appreciate the important contributions made by international organizations, particularly the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Organisation for the Prohibition of

Chemical Weapons and the World Customs Organization in assisting the process of national implementation.

Bangladesh is unequivocally committed to disarmament; this emanates from our constitutional obligations. We have been a forerunner in this field, particularly among the South Asian countries, by becoming a party to almost all major disarmament-related treaties covering nuclear, chemical, biological and conventional weapons.

Bangladesh fully supports resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006). Bangladesh neither develops, manufactures, possesses, transfers nor uses nuclear, chemical or biological weapons or their means of delivery. Nor does it provide any form of support to non-State actors that attempt to do so. We have no intention to acquire such weapons of mass destruction in future and have undertaken significant measures to implement the obligations of those two resolutions at the national level. Bangladesh has already submitted its first national report to the 1540 Committee. We are in the process of drafting national legislation on the Convention on Anti-Personnel Landmines and have destroyed all our stockpiles of landmines. Our draft national legislation on the Chemical Weapons Convention is now under active consideration by the Government.

Bangladesh is still striving for a better degree of implementation by expanding the purview of its non-proliferation-related efforts and through strict enforcement of domestic measures already adopted. We are also in the process of preparing a supplementary report to update the 1540 Committee about the incremental progress we have attained on the domestic implementation front. The report will be submitted soon.

My delegation attaches the utmost importance to forging cooperation between the Security Council and international organizations and to the sharing of experiences and lessons learned between Member States and dedicated international bodies. That would go a long way to overcome the difficulties in implementing the obligations of resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006). We should consolidate this campaign of cooperation and make the best use of it. Similar exchanges among Member States would complement each State's shortcomings and elevate the status of national implementation to the desired level,

which would be a significant leap forward in the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. In that context, we express our readiness to share our experiences and would expect reciprocation of the same.

While acknowledging the genuine difficulties faced by Member States, we should not be oblivious to the absence of genuine political will, which is a major reason behind the dismal level of national implementation. We urge the Member States that have not yet submitted their first national report to do so as soon as possible by taking full advantage of the assistance put forth and in a demonstration of genuine political goodwill.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Brazil.

Mr. Tarragô (Brazil): I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your work as President of the Security Council for the month of February, as well as on your able chairmanship of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004).

This open debate on resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006) is a timely opportunity for Member States to underline their concern that the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, as well as their means of delivery, constitutes a threat to international peace and security. Preventing such proliferation and the horrifying possibility that those weapons may one day fall into terrorist hands requires appropriate action by all Member States.

The risk of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is one of the nefarious consequences of the very existence of those weapons, whose threat will be definitively removed only by means of their complete, verifiable and irreversible elimination.

As one of the countries that helped negotiate resolution 1540 (2004) in 2004, Brazil once again underlines that the core of the work of the 1540 Committee should be that of facilitating the provision of technical assistance. The 1540 Committee should be a vehicle for cooperative efforts and for facilitating the provision of technical assistance to strengthen national capabilities. The final result of the work of the 1540 Committee should be to provide a comprehensive picture of the efforts being undertaken at the national and international levels to respond to the threat posed

by non-State actors having access to weapons of mass destruction.

It is important, however, that the Committee continue to abide by the principle that technical assistance should follow the formal request of a Member State, which alone is in a position to identify its own interests and shortcomings.

In response to specific requests, the Brazilian Government has offered to provide assistance to States in the Latin American and Caribbean region and to other developing countries lacking the legal and/or regulatory infrastructures and implementation experience required to implement the provisions of resolution 1540 (2004). We greatly encourage the continuation of outreach activities — in particular regional seminars such as that held in Lima, Peru, in November 2006 — to States of Latin America and the Caribbean in order to promote greater awareness of the provisions of that resolution.

With regard to the reporting mechanism, we believe that the Committee should concentrate on concluding the evaluation of the national reports — the first report — and of additional information — the second report. Countries that have not yet provided that information should be encouraged to do so as soon as possible. The Committee should establish a date in order for Member States to present a third report, if deemed necessary.

Before concluding, I refer to a recent decision taken by the 1540 Committee to extend the contracts of five of its experts. Two experts, nationals of permanent members of this Council, had their contracts extended until the end of 2007, with the possibility of a further extension. The contracts of the three others, who are not nationals of permanent members, were extended for shorter periods of time.

No clear explanation was provided for such differential treatment of the experts. Possibly, such treatment had to do with the fact that some are nationals of permanent members and some are not. If that is so, it is our hope that in the future similar decisions by the Committee will afford equal opportunity to experts, irrespective of their nationality.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Viet Nam.

Mr. Le Luong Minh (Viet Nam): On behalf of the Vietnamese delegation, I thank you, Sir, and the

Council for permission to participate in this open debate today.

Viet Nam has always held that the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, as well as their means of delivery, constitutes a threat to international peace and security. In our first report, submitted in October 2004, on implementation of resolution 1540 (2004), we committed to continuing to take effective measures to control and prevent the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery and to refrain from providing any form of support to non-State actors that attempt to develop, acquire, manufacture, possess, transport, transfer or use them. Above all, the report reaffirmed that the State of Viet Nam does not have and does not intend to manufacture, acquire, possess, develop, transport, transfer or use any of those weapons. In discussing today the issue of cooperation in implementation of resolution 1540 (2004), we are guided by that fundamental policy and commitment.

While attaching great importance to the role of the 1540 Committee and commending the work it has done so far — especially its efforts to develop a database to provide information on laws, regulations and other measures related to States' implementation of the resolution, as well as to act as a clearing house on assistance to States in need — we also share the view that cooperation at different levels is necessary to ensure implementation of the resolution. My delegation believes that the outreach activities of the Committee have achieved initial concrete results, proved by the successes of recent seminars and workshops, including the seminar for Asia and the Pacific held at Beijing in July 2006 and the workshop of the Regional Forum of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) held at San Francisco last week, in which Viet Nam participated.

Those events have been useful in helping Member States understand better not only the important role of the United Nations in global efforts to eliminate the threat posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, but also the important role that regional organizations, including ones such as the ASEAN Regional Forum, can play in securing implementation of resolution 1540 (2004) by way of increasing awareness of the obligations and requirements of the

resolution, thus facilitating cooperation and coordination on implementation at the regional and global levels. It has been widely recognized that, in many States, the difficulties in implementing the resolution relate not only to the limited knowledge of the issue, but also to the lack of inter-agency coordination and of the resources and means for specific implementation measures.

A close look would reveal that such difficulties are interrelated. Very often, the lack of coordination results from the lack of knowledge and the lack of knowledge itself results from the lack of the resources and means necessary for the dissemination in local languages of relevant information and regulations. Identifying the need of States for assistance has been an important element of such regional and subregional activities. In the view of my delegation, that should also be an important element in cooperation between the Security Council and international organizations in implementation of resolution 1540 (2004).

As organizations established for the purpose of assuring the implementation of, and adherence to, treaty obligations, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons have unique and major roles in preventing the proliferation of nuclear and chemical weapons, in line with the very purpose of resolution 1540 (2004). We support cooperation between those organizations, as well as their cooperation with the Security Council, in the implementation of that resolution. In the same vein, we support cooperation between the Council and the World Customs Organization. In that connection, we wish to echo the widely held view that the implementation of export controls should not be used as a tool to prevent the legitimate development of civilian nuclear, chemical or biological industries that serve peaceful purposes.

We welcome the continuous and close cooperation between the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004), the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) and the Committee established in accordance with resolution 1267 (1999). By sharing their resources, experience and expertise, the 1540 Committee and those organs will certainly better facilitate the effective implementation of the resolution.

There exists an organic relationship between non-proliferation and disarmament. The role and capacity

of United Nations disarmament mechanisms should be strengthened. Cooperation between the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) and United Nations disarmament mechanisms, especially the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs, should be further enhanced.

Viet Nam is a party to all major international disarmament and non-proliferation treaties, including the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Biological Weapons Convention, the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and the Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear Weapon Free Zone. We have always adhered strictly to our obligations under those treaties. We will continue dialogue and cooperation with the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) on the implementation of the resolution.

Finally, before I conclude, let me reaffirm our position that, while cooperation among relevant organizations and cooperation between the Security Council and those organizations in the implementation of resolution 1540 (2004) is necessary, such cooperation must be based on respect for the Charter of the United Nations and national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. Duplication and overlapping of work must be avoided. The implementation of the resolution remains fundamentally a national responsibility.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of New Zealand.

Ms. Banks (New Zealand): I welcome the opportunity to speak today on behalf of the Pacific Islands Forum member States represented in New York, namely, Australia, Fiji, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu and my own country, New Zealand.

At the outset, I would like to stress that the member States of the Pacific Islands Forum fully recognize the importance of resolution 1540 (2004) and take their obligations seriously. There are considerable capacity and resource challenges in our region, particularly for smaller States, in meeting the resolution's obligations, both in terms of reporting and implementation. In that regard, we particularly welcome the comments made by the representatives of South Africa and Indonesia this morning, namely, that the Council should take both capacity and proliferation

risks into account when working with Member States. From our perspective, cooperation between the Council, international and regional organizations and Member States can be extremely helpful in addressing the challenges we face in our region. We would like to offer several brief comments on how to optimize that cooperation.

First, when planning outreach through regional groupings, particularly to the small States in our region, the Council needs to be realistic about the capacity and competing obligations of those States. That means that, where possible, the Security Council should try to combine the approaches of the three relevant Committees so that there can be a coordinated dialogue between the Council and the regional organization concerned over reporting and implementation obligations. We understand fully that the scope of the three resolutions is different, but we do think that there are synergies and efficiencies possible in combined outreach from the Security Council. A streamlined approach will be far more effective in building successful engagement.

Secondly, it is important to recognize that small States have extremely limited resources and are not in a position to absorb multiple technical assistance approaches. To be specific, in our own region, we feel that more than one or two such projects a year would be difficult. Given the limitations imposed by the capacity restraints of small Member States, the Council should be prepared to prioritize its requirements. We note that joint planning is currently under way between the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to hold a workshop in our region on legislative drafting mid-year. We note that the expert group of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) is also interested in a regional workshop. We hope that the Committee can consider a single coordinated event.

Thirdly, one size does not fit all. Workshops need to be targeted to the specific needs of the region, and should be developed in close cooperation with regional members well in advance of the event. Consultation and a realistic lead time should help the development of a project of the greatest possible relevance to the region. Assistance also needs to be able to take into account the specific requirements of individual States.

Fourthly — and this is our last point — technical assistance needs to be a whole package. Workshops are very helpful, but they are only part of the solution. There needs to be a continued focus on capacity-building through the implementation stage. It is important to set up ongoing and more tailored technical support in follow-up to workshops. That requires ongoing investment and support from the international community. We welcome the fact that the representative of the Department for Disarmament Affairs made comments to that effect this morning.

Speaking briefly in my national capacity, I would also like to assure the Council of New Zealand's strong commitment to providing assistance in our region. New Zealand is engaged in ongoing bilateral assistance projects with partners in the Pacific region to assist with reporting and the implementation of resolutions 1257 (1999), 1373 (2001) and 1540 (2004). We hosted a regional meeting in May 2006 that was aimed at building mutual understanding between the Council and the Pacific region on those issues. We believe that helped to lay the foundation for a new style of engagement.

In conclusion, we in the Pacific region greatly appreciate the efforts of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) to engage with our region. We have the will to play our part, and we look forward to the international community's ongoing interest and assistance.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. Danesh-Yazdi (Islamic Republic of Iran): Today the Council is debating a matter of major importance to the international community. The continued existence and development of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and the prospect of non-State actors acquiring such weapons are serious threats faced by the whole world. In addition, the possibility of the use or the threat of use of those weapons by those who possess them is a major threat to international peace and security. Given the gravity and seriousness of those threats, we have never wavered in our support for all efforts genuinely aimed at dealing with this menace, within the parameters of international law.

As a State party to all international instruments banning WMD — namely, the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Biological and Toxin

Weapons Convention and the 1925 Geneva Protocol — and on the basis of our ideological as well as various international commitments, the Islamic Republic of Iran has always considered the possession, acquisition, development and use of WMD to be inhumane, immoral and illegal, and believes that the most effective way to prevent non-State actors from acquiring WMD is through the total elimination of such weapons. Iran, as a recent victim of weapons of mass destruction, strongly believes that the international community must strive to ensure that the nightmare visited by the United States upon the people of Hiroshima and Nagasaki never happens again. Therefore, the only absolute guarantee is the total elimination of nuclear weapons, as stipulated by the NPT and emphasized in the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice.

The growing risk of the acquisition of WMD by terrorists and non-State actors has been a matter of grave concern to all of us in the international community in recent years. The recent heinous terrorist attack in Iraq, in which chlorine gas was used by terrorists, resulting in the death and injury of many innocent Iraqi people, made clear once again the seriousness of this appalling threat. That same concern prompted the general membership in 2003 to adopt General Assembly resolution 57/83, which calls upon all Member States to support international efforts to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.

The adoption of resolution 1540 (2004) and the formation of the relevant Committee by the Security Council was a step along those same lines. By taking this initiative, the Council intended to fill the gap in the non-proliferation regime. However, a number of serious and important questions were arising at the time — questions that remain valid — especially concerning the compatibility of the resolution with the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter as well as international disarmament instruments.

Mindful of the importance of the tasks with which the 1540 Committee has been entrusted, we should make every effort to ensure that actions by the Security Council do not undermine the United Nations Charter, existing multilateral treaties on weapons of mass destruction or international organizations established in that regard, and do not encroach on the prerogatives and authority of the General Assembly.

We believe that a major deficiency of resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006) is their silence on the essential and important issue of disarmament. Equally noticeable, and also unfortunate, is the failure of those resolutions to acknowledge the linkage between non-proliferation and disarmament.

That negligence is in sharp contrast to the relevant General Assembly resolutions and the will of the general membership, which call for urgent progress in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation in order to help maintain international peace and security and contribute to global efforts against terrorism.

The Islamic Republic of Iran shares the view that the objectives of non-proliferation and disarmament are mutually reinforcing and that efforts directed towards non-proliferation should be paralleled by simultaneous efforts aimed at disarmament.

Iran has submitted two national reports to the 1540 Committee. As a State party to all international instruments banning WMD, my country, even before the adoption of resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006), had been implementing the measures called for by those resolutions.

Iran has also enacted a set of national laws and regulations to ban, combat and make punishable the smuggling and illicit trafficking of all types of weapons and ammunition.

However, we are of the strong view that the provisions of those resolutions should not be interpreted or implemented in a manner that conflicts with, or alters, the rights and obligations enshrined in internationally negotiated instruments such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC), as well as the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

As we have indicated time and again, Iran considers the pursuit and development of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes to be its inalienable right, as recognized under the NPT. Upholding the rights of States parties under international treaties is as essential as ensuring respect for their obligations. Indeed, these regimes, including the NPT, are sustained by a balance between rights and obligations. Iran has clearly and continuously stressed that nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction have no place in its

military doctrine. Therefore, the reference made by a very few speakers at this meeting to Iran's peaceful nuclear programme was irrelevant and irresponsible.

In order to dispel any doubts about our peaceful nuclear programme, we have enabled the IAEA to carry out a series of inspections that amounts to the most robust inspection of any IAEA member State. All reports by the IAEA since 2003 have been indicative of the peaceful nature of the Iranian nuclear programme, and the Agency has repeatedly reaffirmed that it has not seen any diversion of nuclear material to nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices in Iran's peaceful nuclear programme. That has also been stressed by the Director General of the IAEA in various public statements.

It is, however, regrettable that despite all these unambiguous acknowledgements, an ill-intended and extensive campaign with political motivations has been under way that is attempting to distort and fabricate facts and realities concerning Iran's peaceful nuclear programme, as we have witnessed at today's meeting in the form of the baseless allegations made against my country by the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and the Israeli regime. Yet, in spite of the massive political and propaganda machine that is at work, no one in today's world can accept the convoluted logic that it is all right for them to have nuclear weapons and threaten others with their massive arsenals and aggressive policies, while crying wolf about others' peaceful nuclear programmes.

We have demonstrated our resolve not to give in to the pressure resulting from groundless and unsubstantiated allegations and ulterior political motives. Iran has abided by its obligations under international treaties. It has adhered to them and continues to do so.

The President: After consultations among members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The Security Council affirms its determination to promote increased multilateral cooperation as an important means of enhancing States' implementation of resolution 1540 (2004).

"The Security Council recalls its resolution 1540 (2004) of 28 April 2004 and resolution 1673 (2006) of 27 April 2006 and stresses the

importance of compliance with resolution 1540 (2004) through the achievement of the implementation of its requirements.

"The Security Council acknowledges with appreciation the activities of international organizations with expertise in the field of non-proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and their means of delivery covered by resolution 1540 (2004), in particular the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, especially in providing assistance in the implementation of that resolution, without altering their mandates and responsibilities.

"The Security Council takes note of the relevant activities of the World Customs Organization (WCO) and the relevant international arrangements. The Security Council also notes with appreciation the seminars and workshops that have been held with countries and regional and subregional organizations in order to promote experience-sharing and the full implementation of resolution 1540 (2004).

"The Security Council is mindful of the need further to explore with international, regional and subregional organizations experience-sharing and lessons learned in the

areas covered by resolution 1540 (2004), and the availability of programmes which might facilitate implementation of the resolution.

"The Security Council reiterates its determination to enhance its cooperation with international organizations and to develop preferred mechanisms for cooperating with those organizations on a case-by-case basis, reflecting the variation in each organization's capacity and mandate, including in assisting States in providing the Committee with information. It still encourages an ongoing process of implementation of resolution 1540 (2004) as set out in the Committee's report of 25 April 2006, as well as assistance to Member States in their capacity building and planning of the process of implementation of resolution 1540 (2004) in accordance with provisions of operative paragraph 7 of resolution 1540 (2004) and paragraph 5 of resolution 1673 (2006)."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2007/4.

There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.